S.N	Slate/UTs	1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000	
		Target	Achiev ement	Target	Achiev ement	Target	Achieve ment
11.	Kerala		@		@		@
12.	Madhya Pradesh	Planning	463	Planning	300	Planning	45
13.	Maharashtra		$		$		$
14.	Manipur		52		50		11
15.	Meghalaya	Commi- ssion.	43	Commi- ssion	Nil	Commi- ssion	Nil(a)
16.	Mizoram		12		3		4
17.	Nagaland		Nil		10		Nil(a)
18.	Orissa		800		817		683
19.	Punjab		@		9		9
20.	Rajasthan		698		685		196
21.	Sikkim		$		$		$
22.	Tamil Nadu		@		9		9
23.	Tripura		15		3		4
24.	Uttar Pradesh		851		711		362(b)
25.	West Bengal		48		83		156(b)
	TOTAL.(States):		3207		2780		1486
	TOTAL UTs:		@		@		@ '
	TOTAL (All India):		3207		2780		1486

@ Cent percent villages electrified.
$ Cent percent villages electrified as per 1981 census.
NA Not available
(a) Achievement from 1.4.99 to 30.11.99
(b) Achievement from 1.4.99 to 31.12.99

Electrification of Villages

2239. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that at the current rate of rural electrification, it will take "702 years to electrify all the villages in the country" as reported in the Indian Express dated 26th February, 2000;

(b) if so, what are the details in this regard indicating which State is leading/far behind during 1998-99, 1999-2000 till date;

(c) whether any conference of State Power Ministers was held, recently, in New Delhi, to discuss this issue;

(d) if so, the details of discussion/outcome thereof; and

(e) what is the present position particularly in Rajasthan and Orissa in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTI MEHTA): (a) Financial outlays as well as physical targets for Rural Electrification Programme state-wise in the country are finalised by the Planning Commission on an annual basis. Further the progress in rural electrification is a continuous process and the time frame for electrification would depend upon the availability of the financial resources for ereating infrastructure system, availability of power in the State etc.

(b) Year-wise, State-wise progress of village electrification during 1998-99 and 1999-2000 as on 31.12.1999 are at given attached Statement-I and II *(See* below). It would be seen from the Annexures that Orissa has electrified the highest number of villages and in the State of Meghalaya, no electrification of villages has taken place during the above mentioned period.

(c) and (d) Conference of Chief Ministers' and Power Ministers' was held in New Delhi on 26.2.2000. The Conference discussed various measures to improving viablity of State Electricity Boards including compulsory metering and distribution reforms. The conclusions arrived at in the conference are at attached statement III *(See* below).

(e) Village electrification in the State of Rajasthan and Orissa are detailed

States	Total number of inhabited Villages as per 1991 Census	Total villages electrified as on 31.1.2000
Orissa	46989	35125
Rajasthan	37889	35133

Statement-I

Year-wise and stale-wise progress of village electrification during 1998-99 (1991 census)

SI. No.	States/UTs	1998-99 Achievement
1.	Andhra	@
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	48
3.	Assam	Nil
4.	Bihar	8
5.	Goa	$
6.	Gujarat	4
7.	Haryana	@
8.	Himachal Pradesh	45
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	NA
10.	Karnataka	13
11.	Kerala	@
12.	Madhya Pradesh	300
13.	Maharashtra	$
14.	Manipur	50
15.	Meghalaya	Nil
16.	Mizoram	3
17.	Nagaland	10
18.	Orissa	817
19.	Punjab	@
20.	Rajasthan	685
21.	Sikkim	$
22.	Tamil Nadu	@
23.	Tripura	3
24.	Uttar Pradesh	711
25.	West Bengal	83
	TOTAL (STATES)	2780
	TOTAL UTs	@
	TOTAL (ALL INDIA)	2780

@Cent percent villages electrified.
$Cent percent villages electrified as per 1981 census.
NA not available.

Statement-II

Progress in Eelctrification of Villages upto December, 1999

SI. No.	States	Total of villages (1991 census)	Achievements as on (Provi.)	%age	Achievement during Dec. 99	Cumulative achievement to the end of Dec.	%age	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Andhra Pradesh	26586	26565	100	—	26565	100	Fully electrified balance not feasible.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3649	2147	59	0	2147	59	Progress reported upto end 9/99.
3.	Assam	24685	19019	77	NA	19019	77	Progress reported upto end of 3/99
4.	Bihar	67513	47845	71	6	47851	71	Achievement as per 1981 census. Progress reported to the end of 8/99
5.	Goa	360	360	100		360	100	Provisional to be confirmed as per 1991 census.
6.	Gujarat	18028	17940	100		17940	100	Fully electrified as on 31.12.98
7.	Haryana	6759	6759	100		6759	00	Balance not
8.	Himachal Pradesh	16997	16819	99	4	16823	99	100 % electrified as per census.
9.	Jammu 4 Kashmir	6477	6315	97	NA	6315	97	Achievement as per 1971 census, 1991 census not held, progress reported to the end of 3/98.
10.	Karnataka	27066	26676	99	2	26678	99	287 villages declared non-feasible. 100 % electrified as per 1981 census. Progress reported to the end of 10/99
11.	Kerala	1384	1384	100		1384	100	
12.	Madhya	71526	68259	95	37	68296	95	
13.	Maharashtra	40412	40412	100		40412	100	Provisional to be confirmed as per 1991 census
14.	Manipur	2182	1990	91	2	1992	91	
15.	Meghalaya	5484	2510	46	0	2510	46	Progress reported to the end of 11/99.
16.	Mizoram	698	687	98	1	688	99	
17.	Nagaland	1216	1163	96	0	1163	96	Progress reported to the end of 9/99.
18.	Orissa	46989	34442	73	636	35078	75	
19.	Punjab	12428	12428	100		12428	100	
20.	Rajasthan	37889	34937	92	132	35069	93	Achievement as per 1981 census. Progress reported upto 11/99
21.	Sikkim	447	405	100		405	100	Provisional (to be confirmed). 42 Nos. forest villages not electified
22.	Tamil Nadu	15822	15822	100		15822	100	
23.	Tripura	855	806	94	2	808	95	

SI. No	States	Total No. of villages (1991 census)	Achievements as on 31 (Provi.)	%ag	Achievement ing Dec.99	Cumulative achievement to the end of Dec.	%ag	Remarks
24.	Uttar Pradesh	112803	88641	79	357	88998	79	Achievement as per 1981 census. Progress reported to the end of 11/99
25.	West Bengal	37910	29402	78	142	29544	78	Achievement as per 1981 census. Progress reported upto U/99
	TOTAL:	586165	503733	86	1321	505054	86	
	UTs:	1093	1090	100	0	1090	100	Fully electrified balance not feasible.
	G. TOTAL:	587258	504823	86	1321	506144	86	

Source CEA

Statement-III

Resolution of the Chief Ministers/Power Ministers Conference Held on 26.02.2000

The Power Ministers' Conference took note of the impending difficult situation facing the power supply industry in the country due to continuing decline in commercial viability of the sector as a whole. It noted the fact that:—

1. Outstanding dues of CPSUs have been increasing and have now reached Rs. 23,000 crores. This trend if maintained would adversely affect their current operations apart from their future expansion plans.
2. Financial closure for private power projects is becoming increasingly difficult.
3. The states are unable to finance new projects on their own.
4. Increases in budgetary support from state governments as well as central government for this sector is not feasible due to fiscal deficits.

II. The primary factors responsible for this unsustainable financial situation are:

(i) Theft and pilferage at the macro level are estimated to be over Rs. 20,000 crores per annum.

(ii) Technical losses in transmission & distribution for the country are also too high.

(iii) Large number of the thermal stations in the State sector run at an operational efficiency of less than 40%.

(iv) The average annual operational losses of the State Power Sector for the country is over as. 12,000 crores.

III. It was also recognised that the cross subsidies cannot be sustained if industrial tariffs make Industry non-competitive in the new environment of increasing globalisation with elimination of quantitative and other restrictions. It becomes necessary to ensure that Indian Industry is not handicapped by unsatisfactory power supply or by tariff which makes it non-competitive. Further, the consumer, including the fanner has a legitimate claim for uninterrupted good quality power supply. His willingness to pay reasonable costs is underestimated.

Resolutions

1. The Power Ministers' resolved after taking into account all the problems facing the power sector, that with the intention of achieving commercial viability and providing power at reasonable rate to all, reform must be undertaken with determination, vigor and a sense of urgency. Delay in reform only increases the financial cost of reforms, and the burden of liabilities only increases. Reforms must begin to show results within the next 2-3 years. The key elements of the reform strategy are:—

(a) Energy Audit at all levels.

(b) Time-bound programme of 100% metering of all consumers by December 2001.

(c) Reduction and finally, elimination of power theft within a specified time frame.

(d) Strengthening/upgradation of sub-transmission and distribution system by taking sub-station as an unit on a priority basis.

2. If the above appears unattainable in the existing set up corporatisation/ cooperatization/privatization of distributions, would have to be undertaken.

3. Since a large number of thermal stations within the State sector are running at a PLF below 40% immediate Renovation & Modernisation including Life Extension would need to be undertaken on an urgent

basis. Similarly, R&M/LE would require to be undertaken for old hydel power plants on priority.

4. Effective functioning of State Electricity Regulatory Commissions is essential for rationalization of tariff, and balancing the interests of the consumer and the need for commercial viability of the utilities in the environment where private sector participation in the industry is expected to gradually increase.

5. Unbundling and corporatization of State Electricity Boards/ bench-marking through separate distribution profit centres/corporations/ companies may facilitate the Regulatory Commissions in prom- oting competition within the power supply industry—competition being the key to lower prices.

6. It was noted that the power system network in country has an unmatched reach to consumers and with the installation of optic fibre cables along the existing power lines using its right of way, it has the potential of generating very large resources in the coming years by providing facilities for multipurpose communication including cable TV, IT services, Telecom services, etc. Hence efforts need to be made to creatively tap this potential source of large revenue from convergence.

7. In order to promote reforms, a new draft central legislation which obviates the need for separate enactments for the States, is being considered. The draft Bill submitted by the NCAER would form the basis for a national debate and a consensus on the contents of the new Bill. The States would be sending their detailed comments on this draft Bill, to the Ministry of Power at the earliest.

Conference of State Power Ministers

2240. SHRI ABANI ROY: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether a conference of State Power Ministers was held recently at New Delhi;

(b) if so, the details of discussions held in the conference and outcome thereof;

(c) whether the financial health of the SEBs have been deteriorating day by day;